

**REMARKS:**

Applicant has carefully studied the final Examiner's Action and all references cited therein. The amendments to claims 1-7 serve to clarify the invention. The amendments do not add limitations or change the scope of the claims; thereby eliminating the need for further search by the Office.

Applicant believes these explanatory remarks are fully responsive to the Action. Accordingly, this important patent application is in condition for allowance. Applicant responds to the outstanding Action by centered headings that correspond to the centered headings employed by the Office, to ensure full response on the merits to each finding of the Office.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Applicant acknowledges the quotation of 35 U.S.C § 102(b).

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by Breider (U.S. 4,985,692). Applicant respectfully submits that Breider does anticipate as the reference does not contain all the elements recited in the claims at bar.

With specific reference to independent Claim 1, the Office states that Breider teaches a Braille display as claimed and including a plurality of Braille cells 4, a mount adapted to releasably attach said Braille display to the notetaker 1, and a connector on said Braille display adapted to engage a mating connector on an attached notetaker for receiving data to be displayed from such notetaker (col. 2, lines 31-34), said Braille display being powered through a connection between said Braille display and an attached notetaker, and a port adapted to be connected to a personal computer 1 for receiving data to be displayed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Breider does not anticipate the invention as currently claimed because Breider discloses a portable computer with a viewing screen having a conventional keyboard, and which also has an additional barlike module including a Braille reading line, which is placed at some distance in front of, and parallel to, the space bar of the

keyboard (col. 1, lines 28-34). The portable computer described by Breider is not equivalent to a notetaker as commonly known in the art. As described in paragraph [0002] of the specification as originally filed, a notetaker is a special purpose portable computer which includes a Braille keyboard, or a QWERTY keyboard, for inputting information which is stored in an internal memory. Accordingly, the Breider device does not include a notetaker and as such has no mechanical or electrical connectors that enable a Braille display to be mechanically and electrically connected to a notetaker. The claimed invention recites a structure that provides mechanical and electrical connection between a Braille display and a notetaker. The claimed invention also discloses releasable mechanical and electrical connectors so that the Braille display and the notetaker can be detached from one another so that the Braille display can be connected to a PC by a conventional cable.

For the reasons indicated above, the Applicant believes that amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Brieder and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-6 are dependent upon claim 1, and are therefore allowable as a matter of law.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Applicant acknowledges the quotation of 35 U.S.C § 103(a).

Claims 3 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breider in view of Kerai (U.S. 2002/0005707)

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness the prior art cited must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Neither the Breider reference nor the Kerai reference teaches a notetaker and as such they have no mechanical or electrical connectors that enable a Braille display to be mechanically and electrically connected to a notetaker. The claimed invention recites a structure that provides mechanical and electrical connection between a Braille display and a notetaker. The claimed invention also discloses releasable mechanical and electrical connectors so that the Braille display and the notetaker can be detached from one another so that the Braille display can be connected to a PC by a conventional cable. Applicant has already shown that Breider does

FEB 16 2007

not contain all the elements of the present invention. Kerai also does not contain all the elements of Applicant's invention. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because the cited references fail to disclose all the elements of Applicant's invention. Applicant is therefore under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness.

Claims 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breider in view of Becker (U.S. 4,445,871)

In a *prima facie* case of obviousness the prior art cited must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Neither the Breider reference nor the Becker reference teaches a notetaker and as such they have no mechanical or electrical connectors that enable a Braille display to be mechanically and electrically connected to a notetaker. The claimed invention recites a structure that provides mechanical and electrical connection between a Braille display and a notetaker. The claimed invention also discloses releasable mechanical and electrical connectors so that the Braille display and the notetaker can be detached from one another so that the Braille display can be connected to a PC by a conventional cable. Applicant has already shown that Breider does not contain all the elements of the present invention. Becker also does not contain all the elements of Applicant's invention. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because the cited references fail to disclose all the elements of Applicant's invention. Applicant is therefore under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness.

#### Conclusion

Applicant has shown that the references cited do not represent a *prima facie* case of anticipation, nor do they render the invention obvious in conjunction, because they do not contain all the elements of Applicant's invention as arranged in the claims.

If the Office is not fully persuaded as to the merits of Applicant's position, or if an Examiner's Amendment would place the pending claims in condition for allowance, a telephone call to the undersigned at (813) 925-8505 is requested.

Very respectfully,

SMITH & HOPEN, P.A.

*Molly L. Sauter*

Dated: February 16, 2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Molly L. Sauter  
180 Pine Avenue North  
Oldsmar, Florida 34677  
(813) 925-8505  
Agent for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

(37 C.F.R. 1.8(a))

I HEREBY CERTIFY that this Amendment A, including Introductory Comments, Amendments to the Claims and Remarks is being transmitted by facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Central Fax, Attn: Kevin D. Williams, Art Unit: 2854 (571) 273-8300 on February 16, 2007.

Dated: February 16, 2007

*April Turley*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
April Turley